Appl. No. 10/710,840 Amdt. dated January 16, 2007 Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant requests that the application be amended as above described. Claims 1 to 17 have been amended to clarify the invention recited therein.

Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figs. 5-7 because of poor reproducibility.

Applicant has amended Figs. 5-7 and supplied replacement sheets to rectify the poor reproducibility.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 USC 112 for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention, for being narrative in form and containing indefinite and functional or operational language, for lacking structure, for being formed with multiple sentences, for employing improper sub-headings, for improper dependencies, and including reference characters.

Applicant has amended claims 1-17 to more clearly define the present invention. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant therefore requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Conclusion

A Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time is enclosed under separate cover. If any further fee is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP for which account the undersigned is authorized.

The Examiner should note that the undersigned submits this response as per MPEP § 405 under the authority of 37 CFR 1.34.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and favorable action to that end is respectfully requested.

> Respectfully submitted, Konstandinos ZAMFES

By: /Dennis R. Haszko, Reg. No. 39,575/

Dennis R. Haszko Reg. No. 39,575

Patent Law Office of D. R. Haszko

499 Mosher Hill road

Farmington, ME 04938-5405

Tel: (207) 615-0424 Fax: (207) 615-0433

E-mail: DRH@LettersPatent.com

DRH/TW